UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,821	12/19/2001	Denis Proulx	1400.1374890	9507

25697 7590 08/27/2004

ROSS D. SNYDER & ASSOCIATES, INC.
115 WILD BASIN RD.
SUITE 107
AUSTIN, TX 78746

EXAMINER	
ARSHAD, UMAR	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/027,821	PROULX ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Umar Arshad	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 December 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/10/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen, U.S. Patent No. 6,772,204 in view of Lam et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,381,237.

As per claim 1, Hansen teaches a network administration method for provisioning logical configuration links for at least two network devices through a dedicated graphical user interface form, the method comprising:

selecting a network device having at least one network interface through the dedicated graphical user interface form (see Hansen, column 12, lines 36 – 45);

determining local interface and next neighbor information for the network device (see Hansen, column 12, lines 62 – 66);

determining whether the local interface and next neighbor information is associated with a logical configuration link stored among a plurality of logical configuration links in a logical link database (see Hansen, column 13, lines 40 – 48);

validating the new logical configuration link (see Hansen, column 13, lines 25 – 33);

sending the new logical configuration link to the network device (see Hansen, column 15, lines 4 – 13); and

displaying a graphical representation of the new logical configuration link on a display device (see Hansen, column 13, lines 52 – 56).

Hansen does not teach creating a new logical configuration link when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link database and storing the new logical configuration link in the logical link database. Lam teaches creating a new logical configuration link when connection information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link database and storing the new logical configuration link in the logical link database (see Lam, column 9, lines 1 – 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lam with the method of Hansen in order to provide an up-to-date interface to the user.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Hansen and Lam teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Hansen further teaches the method of claim 1,

wherein the step of creating a new logical configuration link further comprises the steps of:

selecting a link type (see Hansen, column 13, lines 5 – 8);

selecting a link numbering type for the new logical configuration link (see Hansen, column 14, lines 26 – 33);

selecting a link application for the new logical configuration link (see Hansen, column 14, lines 26 – 33);

selecting a sub layer interface type for the new logical configuration link (see Hansen, column 14, lines 26 – 33);

creating a first endpoint for the new logical configuration link; and

creating a second endpoint for the new logical configuration link (see Hansen, column 12, lines 36 – 45).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Hansen and Lam teach the method of claim 2 (see rejection above). Hansen further teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the step of selecting the link type further comprises the step of selecting a point-to-point link type (see Hansen, column 13, lines 5 – 8).

However, Hansen does not selecting the link type from among a group consisting of: point-to-point, point-to-IP, and point-to-subnet. The examiner takes official notice that point-to-IP and point-to-subnet link types are notoriously well known in the art of computer networks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to incorporate point-to-IP and point-to-subnet link types with the method of Hansen in order to provide access to well established configurations.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 2, Hansen and Lam teach the method of claim 2 (see rejection above). Hansen further teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the step of selecting a link numbering type further comprises the step of selecting a numbered link numbering type (see Hanson, column 14, lines 26 - 28).

Hansen does not teach selecting the link numbering type from a group consisting of: a numbered type and an unnumbered type. However, the unnumbered link numbering type is notoriously well known in the art of computer networks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the unnumbered link numbering type with the method of Hansen in order to provide access to well established configurations.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 2, Hansen and Lam teach the method of claim 2 (see rejection above). Hansen does not teach the method of claim 2, wherein the step of selecting a link application further comprises the step of: selecting the link application from a group consisting of: Internet Protocol Forwarding, Multi-protocol Label Switching and Internet Protocol Forwarding, and Multi-Protocol Label Switching.

However, Internet Protocol Forwarding, Multi-protocol Label Switching and Internet Protocol Forwarding, and Multi-Protocol Label Switching are notoriously well

known in the art of computer networks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Internet Protocol Forwarding, Multi-protocol Label Switching and Internet Protocol Forwarding, and Multi-Protocol Label Switching with the method of Hansen in order to provide access to well established configurations.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 2, Hansen and Lam teach the method of claim 2 (see rejection above). Hansen does not teach the method of claim 2, wherein the step of selecting a sub layer interface type further comprises the step of:

selecting the sub layer interface type from a group consisting of: Packet Over Sonet, Asynchronous Transfer Mode, and GigEthemet.

However, Packet Over Sonet, Asynchronous Transfer Mode, and GigEthemet are notoriously well known in the art of computer networks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Packet Over Sonet, Asynchronous Transfer Mode, and GigEthemet with the method of Hansen in order to provide access to well established configurations.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Hansen and Lam teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Hansen does not teach the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of: modifying a logical configuration link in the logical link database.

Lam teaches modifying a logical configuration link in the logical link database (see Lam, column 10, lines 8 – 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lam with the method of Hansen in order to provide an up-to-date interface to the user.

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Hansen and Lam teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Hansen further teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of:

deleting a logical configuration link in the logical link database (see Hansen, column 13, lines 37 – 39).

As per claim 9, Hansen teaches an apparatus for provisioning logical configuration links comprising:

storing logical configuration links (see Hansen, column 14, lines 53 – 61);

a processing system for accessing the stored logical configuration links; and

a display device coupled to the processing system for displaying a graphical user interface form comprising a graphical representation of a logical configuration link (see Hansen, column 3, lines 12 – 20 and column 5, lines 19 – 26).

Hansen does not teach a logical link database for storing logical configuration links. Lam teaches a logical link database for storing logical configuration links (see Lam, column 1, lines 56 – 58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lam with the method of Hansen in order to provide a resource of data describing connections in a network.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Hansen and Lam teach the method of claim 9 (see rejection above). Hansen further teaches the apparatus of claim 9 wherein the display device provides an ability to select a network device having at least one network interface through the graphical user interface form (see Hansen, column 12, lines 36 – 45).

As per claims 11 – 16, they all recite limitations that are addressed in the rejection for claim 1 and are rejected in the same rationale as they are rejected in claim 1 (see rejection above).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

UA

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100